



are insufficient to sustain Plaintiff's CFA claim." Although Plaintiff asserts the Court misunderstood its claim, Plaintiff fails to cite any case law overlooked, or intervening, and fails to raise information that the Court did not take into consideration. D.N.J. Civ. R. 7.1(i); Max's Seafood Cafe ex rel. Lou-Ann, Inc. v. Quinteros, 176 F.3d 669, 677 (3d Cir. 1999) (citing N. River Ins. Co. v. CIGNA Reinsurance Co., 52 F.3d 1194, 1218 (3d Cir. 1995)); United States v. Compaction Sys. Corp., 88 F. Supp. 2d 339, 345 (D.N.J. 1999). Despite Plaintiff's argument within his brief that Defendants engaged in "extensive 'post-claim' underwriting" (Pl.'s Br. 2) the complaint lacks any assertion that Defendants entered into a scheme to defraud Plaintiff by issuing a policy with the intention, ab initio, to deny coverage. Further, Plaintiff admits within his complaint that he submitted an application "incomplete on its face," detracting from his bare allegation of fraud by Defendant. (Compl. ¶ 13.)

Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration merely asserts a difference of opinion with the Court's July Order, and does not raise new law, or facts, or issues overlooked by the Court. Chicosky v. Presbyterian Med. Ctr., 979 F. Supp. 316, 318 (D.N.J. 1997) (stating a party asserting a difference of opinion with a court's decision should not bring a motion for reconsideration; rather, he or she should seek relief through the normal appellate process); Florham Park Chevron, Inc. v. Chevron U.S.A., Inc., 680 F. Supp. 159, 163 (D.N.J. 1988). As such, Plaintiff's motion will be denied.

#### IV. Conclusion

Therefore, for the reasons given above, and for good cause shown,

It is on this 4th day of September 2007,

**ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration [11] is **DENIED**.

s/ Anne E. Thompson  
\_\_\_\_\_  
ANNE E. THOMPSON, U.S.D.J.